

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

AUSTIN 11, TEXAS



Konorable George H. Shoppard Comptroller of Public Accounts Austin, Texas

Dear Sirt

Opinion No. 0-3546
Re: Intangible tax and grees
receipts tax levied against
noter bus companies and carriers.

In your letter of May 15, 1941, you request our opinion in response to the following questions:

"Reference is made to Article XIII and XIV of House Bill He. 8 of the Regular Session of the Forty-seventh Legislature.

"Article XIII requires all motor-bus companies defined in Chapter 270, Acts of the Regular Session of the Fertieth Legislature, etc., 'and each common carrier motor earrier operating under certificates of convenience and necessity issued by the Railroad Commission of Texas. . . ' to pay an intengible tex.

"Article XIV requires each individual partnership, company, etc., doing business as a motor-bus company as defined in Chapter 270, Acts of the Regular Session of the Fortieth Legislature, de., or a motor carrier or a contract carrier as defined in Chapter 247, Acts of the Regular Session of the Forty-second Legislature, ever and by use of the public highways of the state to pay a gross receipts tax but provides that, 'carriers of persons or preperty who are required to pay an intangible assets tax under the laws of this "tate are hereby exempted from the provisions of this Article.'

Hon. Goorge H. Shoppard, page 2

"The question has arisen in this department as to just what motor carriers are required to pay intengible taxes and those required to pay gress receipts taxes under these two Articles.

- "(1) Would those vehicles operating under the certificate of convenience and necessity constitute the class that pays the intangible tax and those that operate under permits constitute the class that pays the gross receipts tax?
- "(2) May the Intangible Tax Board levy the tax against motor-bus companies subject to the payment of intangible taxes for the year 1941?
 (3) If not, would such companies be required to pay a gross receipts tax for the year 1941?

"A carge of wool is received at San Angele, Texas, by a permit carrier under Article XIV of House Bill No. 8, Ferty-seventh Legislature, for interstate shipment from San Angele to Boston. The carrier received at San Angele the entire cost of the freight to Boston. He hauls the carge of wool to Houston by truck and delivere it to ship lines which earry the wool on to Boston and pays the ship line its portion of the freight.

(4) Is such earrier required to pay grees receipts for hauling this cargo; (5) if so, on what portion of the freight bill?"

All meter bus companies licensed under Article 911a, Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes, are declared to be common carrièrs by that statute. While the words "certificate" and "permit" are both found in the Act, we find they are used interchangeably in most instances. Actually the instruments issued by the Railroad Commission under the Notor Bus Act authorising permanent operations are certificates of convenience and necessity. Under Section 5, the Commission is authorised under certain conditions to issue "temporary certificates or permits."

Hon. George H. Sheppard, page 3

The word "temporary" is necessary in properly describing the instrument thus issued under Section 5.

Under the Motor Carrier Statute, Article 911b, Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes, operating rights of a permanent nature are represented by three types of instruments, namely, certificates of convenience and necessity, centrect carrier permits and special permits (generally called special commodity permits).

Answering your first question, it is our opinion that the intengible tax levied by Article 13 of Neuse Bill 8, in so far as it affects motor bus companies and motor carriers applies only to those holding certificates of convenience and necessity authorizing permanent operations. This leaves the holders of temporary certificates, of contract carrier permits and special commodity permits subject to the tax levied by Article 14, of House Bill 8.

Your second question is answered in the affirmative. From the case of Cadena v. State, 185 S.W.367, we quote:

"All property owned on the let day of January is subject to any tax authorised by law,
whether such taxes have been authorised theretofere or may be authorised during tye year, and
can be levied by the body given the power to levy
at any time during the year. Laws making the
time for the levy of taxes are merely directory,
and legal taxes can be levied whenever the necessity
arises. Laws authorising taxes are not retrospective
so far as the year in which they are authorized is
concerned."

See also, Masterson v. Hedley, 265 8.W. 406; 61 C.J. 564. Your third question need not be netled further, as it was contingent upon a different answer to the second.

Article 14 requires the payment of a tax equal to 2.2 per cent of the gross receipts from "intrastate business done within this State." The business mentioned in your fourth question is clearly interstate. The Act makes no attempt to

Non. George H. Sheppard, page 4

levy the tax on receipts from interstate business even though done in this State. We answer your fourth question in the negative, making it unnecessary to notice the fifth question submitted by you.

Yours very truly ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

By Glena R. Lewis Assistant

GRL: db:bt

APPROVED June 6, 1941

Grovers Sellers First Assistant Attorney General